



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/515,717

02/29/2000

Binh T. Nguyen

IGT1P030/P-282

1099

22434

7590

04/11/2003

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 778
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER

SAGER, MARK ALAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3714

DATE MAILED: 04/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

EXAMINER	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 17

Please find below a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application.

Commissioner of Patents

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration during telephonic discussion on Mar 27, 2003 of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action has been withdrawn.

MARK SAGER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/515,717

Applicant(s)
Nguyen

Examiner
Sager

Art Unit
3714



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sager

(3) _____

(2) Mr. D. Olynick (48615)

(4) _____

Date of Interview Mar 26, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: N/A

Identification of prior art discussed:
none

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:


is
Mr. Olynick requested clarification whether the Office ~~is~~ asserting the claimed invention was 'same' invention and asserted final was improper since invention was not 'same' invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required